



HOFFMAN WARNICK & DALESSANDRO LLC
75 STATE ST
14TH FLOOR
ALBANY NY 12207

COPY MAILED
MAR 26 2008

In re Application of	:	
Fuhwei Lwo	:	
Application No. 10/783,002	:	ON PETITION
Filed: February 20, 2004	:	
Attorney Docket No. RSW920030291US1	:	

This is a decision on the petition filed March 6, 2008, to withdraw the holding of abandonment under 37 CFR 1.181, in accordance with the reasoning of the decision in Delgar Inc. v. Schuyler, 172 USPQ 513.

The petition under 37 CFR 1.181(b) is **DISMISSED**.

This application became abandoned July 18, 2007 for failure to timely reply to the non-Final Office Action mailed April 17, 2007 and which set a three month period for reply. Accordingly, a Notice of Abandonment was mailed February 6, 2008.

The file record discloses that the Notice was mailed to what was believed to be the address of record, the same address to which the Notice of Abandonment was mailed. However, petitioner contends that it was not received.

Unfortunately, the requirement under 37 CFR 1.181, is that petitioner review the docket records and submit copies of the actual docket records or file jacket to show non-receipt. That requirement has not been met. In a petition under 37 CFR 1.181 the petitioner must show, as in this instance where non-receipt is claimed that petitioner is without fault in not receiving the communication. In the absence of any irregularity in the mailing, there is a strong presumption that the Office action was properly mailed to the address of record. This presumption may be overcome by a showing that the Office action was not in fact received at the address of record.

The statements are not enough to substantiate the claim of non-receipt and no other corroborating evidence to prove non-receipt has been presented. In view thereof, the holding of abandonment cannot be withdrawn.

ALTERNATIVE VENUES

Petitioner may wish to consider filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.137(a)¹ or 37 CFR 1.137(b),² which now provides that where the delay in reply was unintentional, a petition may be filed to revive an abandoned application or a lapsed patent pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b).

The filing of a petition under the unintentional standard cannot be intentionally delayed and therefore should be filed promptly. A person seeking revival due to unintentional delay cannot make a statement that the delay was unintentional unless the entire delay, including the delay from the date it was discovered that the application was abandoned until the filing of the petition to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(b), was unintentional. A statement that the delay was unintentional is not appropriate if petitioner intentionally delayed the filing of a petition for revival under 37 CFR 1.137(b).

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

¹ A grantable petition under 37 CFR 1.137(a) must be accompanied by:

(1) the required reply, unless previously filed; In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In a nonprovisional utility or plant application filed on or after June 8, 1995, and abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may also be met by the filing of a request for continued examination in compliance with § 1.114. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof.

(2) the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(l);

(3) a showing to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(a) was unavoidable; and

(4) any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d)) required pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(c)).

² Effective December 1, 1997, the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) now provide that where the delay in reply was unintentional, a petition may be filed to revive an abandoned application or a lapsed patent pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b). A grantable petition filed under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by:

(1) the required reply, unless previously filed. In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In a nonprovisional application filed on or after June 8, 1995, and abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may also be met by the filing of a request for continued examination in compliance with § 1.114. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof. In an application abandoned for failure to pay the publication fee, the required reply must include payment of the publication fee.

(2) the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(m);

(3) a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional; and

(4) any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d)) required pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(c)).

By mail: Mail Stop Petition
 Commissioner for Patents
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By FAX: (571) 273-8300

Telephone inquiries concerning this matter may be directed to the undersigned
Petitions Attorney at (571) 272-3212.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Patricia Faison-Ball". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a large initial 'P'.

Patricia Faison-Ball
Senior Petitions Attorney
Office of Petitions